1	
2	
3	
4	
5	
6	
7	
8	
9	
10	UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
11	WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON AT TACOMA
12	
13	JOSEPH BROWN, CASE NO. C10-5535BHS/JRC
14	Plaintiff, ORDER DENYING PLAINTIFF'S
15	v. MOTION FOR APPOINTMENT OF COUNSEL
16	MARIN FOX-HEIGHT, Defendant.
17	Defendant.
18	
19	This 42 U.S.C. § 1983 civil rights action has been referred to the undersigned Magistrate
20	Judge pursuant to 28 U.S.C. §§ 636(b)(1)(A) and(B) and Local Magistrate Judges' Rules MJR 1,
21	MJR 3, and MJR 4. The matter is before the court on plaintiff's motion for appointment of
22	counsel (ECF No. 15).
23	There is no right to have counsel appointed in cases brought under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.
24 25	Although the court can request counsel to represent a party, 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e) (1), the court
26	
20	may do so only in exceptional circumstances. Wilborn v. Escalderon, 789 F.2d 1328, 1331 (9th
	Cir. 1986); <u>Franklin v. Murphy</u> , 745 F.2d 1221, 1236 (9th Cir. 1984); <u>Aldabe v. Aldabe</u> , 616

F.2d 1089 (9th Cir. 1980). A finding of exceptional circumstances requires an evaluation of both the likelihood of success on the merits and the ability of the plaintiff to articulate his claims *pro se* in light of the complexity of the legal issues involved. Wilborn, 789 F.2d at 1331.

Plaintiff has demonstrated an adequate ability to articulate his claims *pro se* and has not made an argument regarding the likelihood of success on the merits. The motion, (ECF No. 15), is **DENIED.**

DATED this 7th day of January, 2011.

J. Richard Creatura

United States Magistrate Judge